

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/816,179	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Rudy Zervigon	<b>Art Unit</b> 1763	

**All Participants:**

 (1) Rudy Zervigon.

 (2) M. Mathews Hall.
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 2 August 2007
**Time:** 11:00
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*All pending*

Claims discussed:

1, 24

Prior art documents discussed:

*US 20030232495 A1*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Hall and the Examiner deliberated US 20030232495 A1 and its teachings, especially, if US 20030232495 A1 indeed taught the functional descriptive material of the processor as claimed by claim 1. Further, Mr. Hall suggested adding the amended "source of monomer" as amended to further distinguish. The Examiner consulted the MPEP and his SPE for opinion and concluded that Applicant's positions are valid. Further, as stated by the Examiner in the reasons for allowance, the added structural feature of "source of monomer" and associated chemical features further patentably distinguish the prior art and the amended claims..